REMARKS

In the Office Action issued June 12, 2009, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0226031 to Zimmerman et al. (Zimmerman) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,162,596) to Popp et al. ("Brown") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,560,005 to Hoover et al. ("Hoover"). Claims 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman in view Popp and Hoover and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,694 to Burns et al. (Burns). Claims 1, 5 and 8 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 and 3-8 are now pending in this application.

The applicant respectfully submits that claims 8 is not directed to non-statutory subject matter as now recited. Claim 8 has been amended to recite that the computer readable medium is a storage medium, which is a tangible medium. Accordingly, the applicant requests that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 is not unpatentable over Zimmerman in view of Popp and Hoover. In particular, the present invention, for example, according to claim 1, requires writing source code to cause the call routine of the second self-contained data handling application to cause the software routine of the first self-contained data handling application to be executed.

Zimmermann discloses the use of a dynamic library with an installed application program. A static library allows a Dynamic library to be located, stored, and used by the application. The application can use the library to perform certain features of the application, but

can function properly without the library. See Zimmerman paragraph 7. The library disclosed in Zimmerman, on the other hand, is a collection of subprograms used that can be used by the application to have access to specific features of the application. This allows code and data to be shared and changed in a modular fashion. Zimmerman fails to disclose, as acknowledged by the Examiner, "writing source code to cause the call routine of the second self-contained data handling application to cause the software routine of the first self-contained data handling application to be executed" and that "the first self-contained data handling, application and the second, previously installed, self contained data handling, application are operable to execute without each other."

The Examiner states on page 4 of the Office Action that Popp teaches "writing source code to cause the call routine of the second self-contained data handling application to cause the software routine of the first self-contained data handling application to be executed." However, the Examiner is incorrect. There is no discussion at the portion of the specification identified by the examiner nor in any other portion of the specification that discloses "writing source code to cause the call routine of the second self-contained data handling application to cause the software routine of the first self-contained data handling application to be executed" Accordingly, Popp does not cure the deficiencies of Zimmerman.

Hoover does not cure the deficiencies of Zimmerman and Popp. Hoover merely discloses the use of a process called the "interface open server" that is provided to bridge the processes of a customer database and a remote database. See Hoover, col. 10, lines 17-23. The interface server operates to transform the heterogeneous data models of the customer database into homogeneous data models at the remote database (i.e., making the data models used by the customer database the same as the data models used by the remote database). See Hoover, col.

10, lines 23-27. There is no disclosure in Hoover that source code is written that defines the call routine of the second self-contained data handling application.

Thus, the present invention, according to claim 1, and according to claims 5 and 8, which are similar to claim 1, and according to claims 4, and 7, which depend therefrom, is not unpatentable over Zimmerman in view of Popp and Hoover.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to claims 3 and 6 is not unpatentable over Zimmerman in view of Popp and Hoover further in view of Burns because Burns does not cure the deficiencies of Zimmerman, Popp and Hoover. Thus, the present invention, according to claims 3 and 6 is not unpatentable over Zimmerman in view of Popp, Hoover and Burns.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any over payment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4545 (5231-064-US01).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further

communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Chadwick A. Jackson, #46,495/

Date: November 12, 2009

Chadwick A. Jackson
Reg. No. 46,495

Hanify & King, Professional Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
1055 Thomas Jefferson St, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20007
Direct: (202) 403-2102
Fax: (202) 429-4380